REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **27 September 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 34-35, 37-38, 40-43, 45-46, and 48-49. Claim 1 was objected to because "the compiled application code" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claims 40 and 48 were objected to because they do not further limit the subject matter of the parent claim. Claims 34-35, 37-38, 40-43, 45-46, and 48-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Burgoon (*A Mixed-Language Simulator for Concurrent Engineering*, hereinafter "Burgoon").

Objections to the claims

Claim 1 was objected to because "the compiled application code" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claims 40 and 48 were objected to because they do not further limit the subject matter of the parent claim.

Applicant respectfully points out that claim 1 was previously canceled and assumes that the Examiner meant claim 34. Applicant has amended claims 34 and 42 to clarify the limitations. No new matter has been added. Claims 40 and 48 have been canceled without prejudice.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Independent claims 34 and 42 were rejected as being anticipated by Burgoon. Applicant respectfully points out that Burgoon teaches communicating between the hardware description language portion and the computer programming language portion **using a TCP/IP socket** (see Burgoon, Section 7, second paragraph). Note that this is a problem, which the present invention is designed to overcome (see page 3, lines 8-12 of the instant application).

In contrast, the present invention enables the hardware description language portion to have **direct data access** to and from the computer programming language portion of the executable simulation (see page 4,

6

lines 9-21 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides an integrated system that is faster than the system of Burgoon. There is nothing within Burgoon, either explicit or implicit, which suggests enabling the hardware description language portion to have direct data access to and from the computer programming language portion of the executable simulation.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 34 and 42 to clarify that the present invention enables the hardware description language portion to have direct data access to and from the computer programming language portion of the executable simulation. These amendments find support on page 4, lines 9-21 of the instant application

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 34 and 42 are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 35, 37-38, and 41, which depend on claim 34, and claims 43, 45-46, and 49, which depend on claim 49, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   _[signature]_

Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 18 October 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com